

**From:** CEG1934@aol.com@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/2/02 2:21pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

As an MS stockholder & user, must agree with the dissenting States that the penalties are inadequate in relationship to Microsoft's past practices.

Why the company was not split between Operating System (DOS/Windows) software & User Productivity (Word, Excel, etc. ) software is incomprehensible to me.

In the absence of corrective action on that magnitude, suggest the penalty include:

- 1) explicit ban on "exclusivity" as OpSys provided by hardware vendors
- 2) release of new OpSys specs to outside/3rd-party software suppliers & "in-house" User Productivity @ the same time
- 3) cash penalties (no "software/hardware donations") to be used by school districts to expand computer facilities

MS tries to characterize its past practices as the natural concomitant of "innovation". Except for a few pioneers, all software developers have been innovative & derivative & MS is no exception. NOT all software developers went to restrictive MARKETING techniques to accomplish their goals.

MS has been a major contributor to the realm of personal computing. Certainly no penalty should jeopardize the basic ability of MS to continue that contribution. Alternately, they should not be let off lightly for past transgressions, nor be allowed to finesse a penalty with their plan to "seed" computers to school districts.

Thanks for allowing an opportunity to contribute on this issue.

Carl E. Gallagher  
35 Galilee Lane #4  
San Francisco, CA 94115  
415/567-7978  
CEG1934@aol.com